arXiv:1207.3395v1 [math.FA] 14 Jul 2012

OPERATOR THEORY ON THE TETRABLOCK

TIRTHANKAR BHATTACHARYYA

Abstract. The tetrablock E defined below in Definition 1.1 is a certain polynomially convex subset of $\mathbb{C}^3$. We solve the fundamental equations for a triple $\underline{T} = (T_1, T_2, T_3)$ of commuting bounded operators for which $\overline{E}$ is a spectral set. Such a triple will be called a tetrablock contraction. The fundamental equations are interesting in their own right as well as for their contribution to construction of dilation. A recent study of Γ-contractions has brought out the importance of fundamental operators clearly. We show how the tetrablock is intimately related to the symmatrized bidisc. The theory of Γ-contractions plays a crucial role. We completely decipher the structure of those tetrablock contractions whose spectra are contained in the distinguished boundary of E. As a consequence, we construct explicit dilations for those tetrablock contractions for which T_3 has dense range.

The background material used in this paper involves the theory of Γ-contractions with some new results developed here, characterizations of operators with numerical radius less than or equal to one and the theory of hyponormal operators, apart from complex geometry of the tetrablock and the symmetrized bidisc.

1. Introduction

1.1. Statement of Main Result.

The set tetrablock is defined as

$$E = \{\underline{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3 : 1 - x_1 z - z_2 w + z_3 zw \neq 0 \text{ whenever } |z| < 1 \text{ and } |w| < 1\}. \tag{1.1}$$

Definition 1.1. *Let $\underline{T} = (T_1, T_2, T_3)$ be a triple of commmuting bounded operators on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. We call it a tetrablock contraction if $\overline{E}$ is a spectral set for $\underline{T}$.*

A crucial role will be played by a pair of operator equations. These are so important that we call them the fundamental equations. Since we shall have much use for the defect operator $D_{T_3} = (I - T_3^* T_3)^{1/2}$, we denote it by D. The unknowns in the fundamental equations are F_1 and F_2 as bounded operators on the closure of range of D.

Definition 1.2. *For a commuting triple of contractions $\underline{T} = (T_1, T_2, T_3)$, the equations*

$$T_1 - T_2^* T_3 = DF_1 D, \text{ and } T_2 - T_1^* T_3 = DF_2 D \tag{1.2}$$

are called the first fundamental equation and the second fundamental equation respectively.

One of the results in this paper is about existence and uniqueness of fundamental operators. It is interesting in its own right and plays a big role in the construction of the dilation.

Theorem 1.3. *For a tetrablock contraction $\underline{T} = (T_1, T_2, T_3)$, the two fundamental equations can be solved and the solutions F_1 and F_2 are unique.*

The author was supported in part by a grant from UGC via DSA-SAP..

The dilation theorem of this paper is the following.

Theorem 1.4. *Let the triple* $\underline{T} = (T_1, T_2, T_3)$ *be such a tetrablock contraction on a Hilbert space* $\mathcal{H}$ *that* T_3 *has dense range. Then there is a triple of commuting normal operators* $\underline{N} = (N_1, N_2, N_3)$ *on a Hilbert space* $\mathcal{K}$ *containing* $\mathcal{H}$ *such that the Taylor joint spectrum of* $\underline{N}$ *is contained in* bE*, the distinguished boundary of* E *and*

$$P_{\mathcal{H}} N_1^{k_1} N_2^{k_2} N_3^{k_3}|_{\mathcal{H}} = T_1^{k_1} T_2^{k_2} T_3^{k_3}$$

for all non-negative integers k_1, k_2 *and* k_3.

Such a normal triple, for obvious reasons, will be called the dilation of the given tetrablock contraction. We explicitly construct this dilation. Apart from these two theorems, there are several important results in this paper. We discover the structures of certain classes of tetrablock contractions completely. These two special classes are called tetrablock unitaries and tetrablock isometries respectively. An added source of pleasure consists of numerous relations of the tetrablock to the symmetrized bidisk and of tetrablock contractions to Γ-contractions.

1.2. **Preliminaries on Γ-contractions.** We need this quick exposure to Gamma contractions because many facts about them will be used in this paper. The open symmetrized bidisc is

$$G = \{(z_1 + z_2, z_1 z_2) : z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{D}\}$$

and its closure is denoted by Γ. This is a polynomially convex subset of $\mathbb{C}^2$ with the distinguished boundary

$$b\Gamma = \{(z_1 + z_2, z_1 z_2) : |z_1| = |z_2| = 1\}.$$

A commuting pair of bounded operators (S, P) is called

1. a Γ-contraction if the closed symmetrized bidisc Γ is a spectral set for (S, P),
2. a Γ-unitary if S and P are normal operators with the Taylor joint spectrum of the pair (S, P) contained in $b\Gamma$,
3. a Γ-isometry if it is the restriction of a Γ-unitary to a joint invariant subspace.

Agler and Young studied the Γ-contractions in a series of papers, see [4] - [6]. They applied mainly Ando's dilation results which are limited to two variables. The change in point of view introduced in [9] showed that the question of whether Γ is a complete spectral set or not can be reduced to finding solution of an operator equation. This paper uses that technique of solving operator equations to establish that $\overline{E}$ is a complete spectral set if it is a spectral set for a commuting triple $\underline{T}$ with T_3 having dense range.

A complete picture about Γ-contractions was given in [9]. We pick out the salient features from there as well as from earlier papers of Agler and Young ([6] and [4]) which we summarize below. It is part 3 that relates to operator equation solving. We put in part 2 below for further use later. For a contraction P and bounded operator S commuting with P, define $\rho(S, P) = 2(I - P^*P) - (S - S^*P) - (S^* - P^*S)$.

Theorem 1.5. *Let* (S, P) *be a pair of commuting bounded operators on* $\mathcal{H}$ *with* P *being a contraction. Then the following are equivalent.*

1. Γ *is a spectral set for the commuting pair* (S, P).
2. $I - P^*P \geq Re\beta(S - S^*P)$ *for all* β *on the unit circle. In other words,* $\rho(\beta S, \beta^2 P) \geq 0$ *for all* β *on the unit circle.*

(3) *The operator equation*

$$S - S^*P = (I - P^*P)^{1/2} A (I - P^*P)^{1/2}$$

called its fundamental equation has a unique solution $A \in \mathcal{B}\left(\overline{Ran}(I - P^*P)^{1/2}\right)$ *with numerical radius of* F *being not greater than one.*

(4) *There is a pair of commuting normal operators* R *and* U *on a bigger Hilbert space* $\mathcal{K}$ *containing* $\mathcal{H}$ *such that the Taylor joint spectrum* $\sigma(R, U)$ *is contained in the distinguished boundary of* Γ *and*

$$P_{\mathcal{H}} R^m U^n|_{\mathcal{H}} = S^m P^n$$

for all non-negative integers m *and* n*. Explicit construction of this normal pair involves the fundamental operator* F *obtained above. This implies that* Γ *is a complete spectral set.*

The pair (R, U) described above is called a Γ-unitary for very obvious reasons. Restriction of a Γ-unitary to an invariant subspace is called a Γ-isometry. Certain routine facts will be used without further ado. Some of these are

(1) if (S, P) is a Γ-contraction and P is a unitary, then (S, P) is a Γ-unitary,
(2) if (S, P) is a Γ-contraction and P is an isometry, then (S, P) is a Γ-isometry,

2. THE FUNDAMENTAL EQUATIONS FOR TETRABLOCK CONTRACTIONS

The main content of this section is Theorem 2.4 which solves the fundamental equations for a tetrablock contraction. The tetrablock E is a *polynomially convex*, but non-convex set and has several characterizations as stated below from the paper [1]. It follows from the definition of E that $1 - x_1 z \neq 0 \neq 1 - x_2 z$ for any $\underline{x} \in E$ and any $z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$. Thus the holomorphic functions

$$\Psi(z, \underline{x}) = \frac{x_3 z - x_1}{x_2 z - 1} \text{ and } \Upsilon(z, \underline{x}) = \frac{x_3 z - x_2}{x_1 z - 1} \tag{2.1}$$

can be defined on $\mathbb{D} \times E$. Let $\mathbb{M}_2$ denote the algebra of all 2×2 complex matrices equipped with the operator norm $\|\cdot\|$. Define $\pi : \mathbb{M}_2 \to \mathbb{C}^3$ by

$$\pi\left(\begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} \end{pmatrix}\right) = (a_{11}, a_{22}, \det A).$$

We quote from Abouhajar, White and Young a number of ways for deciding membership of an $\underline{x}$ in E.

Theorem 2.1 (Abouhajar, White, Young)**.** *For* $\underline{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ *in* $\mathbb{C}^3$*, the following are equivalent.*

(1) $\underline{x} \in E$ *(respectively* $\in \overline{E}$*),*
(2) $\|\Psi(\cdot, \underline{x})\|_{H^\infty} < 1$ *(respectively* ≤ 1*),*
(2') $\|\Upsilon(\cdot, \underline{x})\|_{H^\infty} < 1$ *(respectively* ≤ 1*),*
(3) $|x_1 - \overline{x}_2 x_3| + |x_1 x_2 - x_3| < 1 - |x_2|^2$ *(respectively* $\leq 1 - |x_2|^2$*),*
(3') $|x_2 - \overline{x}_1 x_3| + |x_1 x_2 - x_3| < 1 - |x_1|^2$ *(respectively* $\leq 1 - |x_1|^2$*),*
(4) $|x_1|^2 - |x_2|^2 + |x_3|^2 + 2|x_2 - \overline{x}_1 x_3| < 1$ *(respectively* ≤ 1*),*
(4') $-|x_1|^2 + |x_2|^2 + |x_3|^2 + 2|x_1 - \overline{x}_2 x_3| < 1$ *(respectively* ≤ 1*),*
(5) $|x_1|^2 + |x_2|^2 - |x_3|^2 + 2|x_1 x_2 - x_3| < 1$ *(respectively* ≤ 1*),*
(6) $|x_1 - \overline{x}_2 x_3| + |x_2 - \overline{x}_1 x_3| < 1 - |x_3|^2$ *(respectively* $\leq 1 - |x_3|^2$*),*
(7) $\underline{x} = \pi(A)$ *for an* $A \in \mathbb{M}_2$ *with* $\|A\| < 1$ *(respectively* ≤ 1*),*

(8) $\underline{x} = \pi(A)$ *for a symmetric* $A \in \mathbb{M}_2$ *with* $\|A\| < 1$ *(respectively* ≤ 1*),*

(9) $|x_3| < 1$ *(respectively* ≤ 1*) and there are complex numbers* β_1 *and* β_2 *with* $|\beta_1| + |\beta_2| < 1$ *(respectively* ≤ 1*) such that*

$$x_1 = \beta_1 + \overline{\beta}_2 x_3 \text{ and } x_2 = \beta_2 + \overline{\beta}_1 x_3.$$

The theorem above will be crucial for the purpose of this note. And we have a neat new criterion for membership of an (x_1, x_2, x_3) in E.

Lemma 2.2. *The triple* (x_1, x_2, x_3) *is in* E *if and only if the pair* $(x_1 + zx_2, zx_3)$ *is in* G *for every* z *on the unit circle.*

Proof. Theorem 1.1 in [6] gives several characterizations of when a pair (s, p) will be in G. Of those characterizations, the one most suitable for our present purpose is that

$$|s - \overline{s}p| < 1 - |p|^2 \text{ and } |s| < 2. \tag{2.2}$$

Let $s_z = x_1 + zx_2$ and $p_z = zx_3$. Let (x_1, x_2, x_3) be in E. By part (9) of Theorem 2.1, we have $|s_z| < 2$. Now

$$|s_z - \overline{s_z}p_z| = |x_1 + zx_2 - (\overline{x_1} + \overline{zx_2})zx_3| = |x_1 - \overline{x_2}x_3 + z(x_2 - \overline{x_1}x_3)| \leq |x_1 - \overline{x_2}x_3| + |x_2 - \overline{x_1}x_3|.$$

Now appeal to part (6) of Theorem 2.1 above to complete the proof that (s_z, p_z) is in G.

Conversely, let (s_z, p_z) be in G (respectively Γ) for all z on the circle. By the characterization (2.2), we have a function β on the circle which satisfies

$$s_z - \overline{s_z}p_z = \beta(z)(1 - |p|^2) \text{ and } |\beta(z)| < 1.$$

Now

$$\beta(z) = \frac{s_z - \overline{s_z}p_z}{1 - |p|^2} = \frac{x_1 + zx_2 - \overline{x_1 + zx_2}zx_3}{1 - |x_3|^2} = \frac{(x_1 - \overline{x_2}x_3) + z(x_2\overline{x_1}x_3)}{1 - |x_3|^2}.$$

Since this holds for all z on the circle, we have $\beta(z) = \beta_1 + z\beta_2$, where

$$\beta_1 = \frac{x_1 - \overline{x_2}x_3}{1 - |x_3|^2} \text{ and } \beta_2 = \frac{x_2 - \overline{x_1}x_3}{1 - |x_3|^2}.$$

Clearly,

$$x_1 = \beta_1 + \overline{\beta}_2 x_3 \text{ and } x_2 = \beta_2 + \overline{\beta}_1 x_3.$$

Moreover, for any z_1 and z_2 on the unit circle, we have

$$|z_1\beta_1 + z_2\beta_2| = |z_1||\beta_1 + \frac{z_2}{z_1}\beta_2| = |\beta(\frac{z_2}{z_1})| < 1.$$

Now if we choose z_1 and z_2 so that $z_1\beta_1 + z_2\beta_2 = |\beta_1| + |\beta_2|$ and apply part (9) of Theorem 2.1, that finishes the proof. ☐

The first thing to observe about tetrablock contractions is that the defining criterion can be greatly simplified.

Lemma 2.3. *A commuting triple of bounded operators* $\underline{T} = (T_1, T_2, T_3)$ *is a tetrablock contraction if and only if*

$$\|p(\underline{T})\| \leq \|p\|_{\infty, \overline{E}} = \sup\{|p(x_1, x_2, x_3)| : (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \overline{E}\} \tag{2.3}$$

for any holomorphic polynomial p *in three variables.*

Proof. If $\underline{T}$ is a tetrablock contraction, then of course (2.3) just follows from definition.

The converse proof can be easily done by using polynomial convexity of $\overline{E}$. Indeed, if $\sigma(\underline{T})$ is not contained in $\overline{E}$, then there is a point $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ in $\sigma(\underline{T})$ that is not in $\overline{E}$. By polynomial convexity of $\overline{E}$, there is a polynomial p such that $|p(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)| > \|p\|_{\infty, \overline{E}}$. By polynomial spectral mapping theorem,

$$\sigma(p(\underline{T})) = \{p(x_1, x_2, x_3) : (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \sigma(\underline{T})\}$$

and hence the spectral radius of $p(\underline{T})$ is bigger than $\|p\|_{\infty, \overline{E}}$. But then $\|p(\underline{T})\| > \|p\|_{\infty, \overline{E}}$, contradicting the fact that $\overline{E}$ is a spectral set for $\underline{T}$.

By polynomial convexity of $\overline{E}$, a triple satisfying (2.3) will also satisfy

$$\|f(T_1, T_2, T_3)\| \le \|f\|_{\infty, \overline{E}}$$

for any function holomorphic in a neighbourhood of $\overline{E}$. Indeed, Oka-Weil theorem (Theorem 5.1 of [14]) allows us to approximate f uniformly by polynomials. Then Theorem 9.9 of Chapter III of [20] about functional calculus in several commuting operators seals the rest of the deal. □

As a matter of detail, we note the following. These will come handy later.

(1) A tetrablock contraction consists of commuting contractions. This can be seen easily if we take the polynomial $p_i(x_1, x_2, x_3) = x_i$ for any $i = 1, 2, 3$. From various characterizations of E, we know that $\|p_i\|_{\infty, \overline{E}} \le 1$, see part (9) Theorem 2.1 for example. Thus $\|T_i\| = \|p_i(\underline{T})\| \le 1$ for each i.

(2) Restriction of a tetrablock contraction to a joint invariant subspace is a tetrablock contraction. Indeed, if $\mathcal{M}$ is a such a subspace, and p is any polynomial in three variables, then

$$\|p(T_1|_{\mathcal{M}}, T_2|_{\mathcal{M}}, T_3|_{\mathcal{M}})\| = \|p(\underline{T})|_{\mathcal{M}}\| \le \|p(\underline{T})\| \le \|p\|_{\infty, \overline{E}}.$$

Two operator functions of a commuting triple of contractions $\underline{T} = (T_1, T_2, T_3)$ that we shall need are

$$\rho_1(\underline{T}) = I - T_3^* T_3 + (T_2^* T_2 - T_1^* T_1) - 2 \text{ Re } (T_2 - T_1^* T_3)$$

and

$$\rho_2(\underline{T}) = I - T_3^* T_3 + (T_1^* T_1 - T_2^* T_2) - 2 \text{ Re } (T_1 - T_2^* T_3).$$

The numerical radius $w(A)$ of a bounded operator A features naturally. It is defined as

$$w(A) = \sup_{\|x\| \le 1} |\langle Ax, x \rangle| \, .$$

It is well known that $w(A)$ and $\|A\|$ define equivalent norms. Indeed,

$$r(A) \le w(A) \le \|A\| \le 2w(A)$$

for all bounded operators A where $r(A)$ denotes the spectral radius of A.

The main result of this section is the following theorem which gives a chain of one way implications. The main content of the theorem is the existence and uniqueness of soulutions of the fundamental equations for a given tetrablock contraction. However, we have emphasized some intermediate steps which are very important. Note particularly the role played by Γ-contractions. Given two bounded operators X and Y, let $[X, Y]$ denote the commutator $XY - YX$.

Theorem 2.4. *Let T_1, T_2 and T_3 be three commuting contractions on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Then, in the following, $(1) \Rightarrow (2) \Rightarrow (3) \Rightarrow (4)$.*

1. *The triple $\underline{T} = (T_1, T_2, T_3)$ is a tetrablock contraction.*
2. *The operator functions ρ_1 and ρ_2 defined above satisfy*
$$\rho_1(T_1, zT_2, zT_3) \geq 0 \text{ and } \rho_2(T_1, zT_2, zT_3) \geq 0 \text{ for all } z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}.$$
3. *For any $z \in \mathbb{C}$, if we define a pair of operators by*
$$S_z = T_1 + zT_2 \text{ and } P_z = zT_3. \tag{2.4}$$
then (S_z, P_z) is a Γ-contraction for every z on the unit circle.
4. *The fundamental equations (1.2) have unique solutions F_1 and F_2 in $\mathcal{B}(\overline{RanD})$. Moreover, the $\mathcal{B}(\overline{RanD}))$ valued function $F_1 + zF_2$ has numerical radius not greater than 1 for all $z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$.*

Proof. $(1) \Rightarrow (2)$: It is enough to prove that $\rho_1(T_1, zT_2, zT_3) \geq 0$ for all $z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$. The proof for ρ_2 is the same.

Consider the function Ψ defined in 2.1. If $z \in \mathbb{D}$, then $\Psi(z, \cdot)$ is a holomorphic function on E with
$$\Psi(z, \underline{T}) = (zT_3 - T_1)(I - zT_2)^{-1}.$$
Because $\overline{E}$ is a spectral set for $\underline{T}$, we know that $\|\Psi(z, \underline{T})\| \leq 1$ which in other words means that
$$(I - \overline{z}T_2^*)^{-1}(\overline{z}T_3^* - T_1^*)(zT_3 - T_1)(I - zT_2)^{-1} \leq I$$
which translates to
$$(\overline{z}T_3^* - T_1^*)(zT_3 - T_1) \leq (I - \overline{z}T_2^*)(I - zT_2)$$
and finally
$$|z|^2 T_3^*T_3 - \overline{z}T_3^*T_1 - zT_1^*T_3 + T_1^*T_1 \leq I - zT_2 - \overline{z}T_2^* + |z|^2$$
which is nothing but $\rho_1(T_1, zT_2, zT_3) \geq 0$. Since this holds for all z in the disk and since the function ρ_1 is continuous, the inequality holds on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. That finishes the proof of this step.

Lemma 2.2 showed that the terablock is intimately connected with the symmetrised bidisc. In the following, we shall see that the same is true for tetrablock contractions and Γ-contractions. Many facets of the theory of Γ-contractions will be used in this paper.

$(2) \Rightarrow (3)$: Let P be a contraction and let S commute with P. One of the criteria for such a commuting pair of operators (S, P) to be a Γ-contraction is that $\rho(\alpha S, \alpha^2 P) \geq 0$ for all α on the unit circle, see Theorem 1.5. Since we have
$$\rho_1(T_1, z_1T_2, z_1T_3) \geq 0 \text{ and } \rho_2(T_1, z_2T_2, z_2T_3) \geq 0$$
for all z_1 and z_2 on the circle, adding these two, we get
$$D^2 \geq \text{ Re } (z_1\Sigma_1 + z_2\Sigma_2) = \text{ Re } (z_1(\Sigma_1 + \overline{z_1}z_2\Sigma_2)).$$
So for all α and z on the circle. we have
$$\begin{aligned} D^2 &\geq \text{ Re } (\alpha(\Sigma_1 + z\Sigma_2)) \\ &= \text{ Re } (\alpha(T_1 - T_2^*T_3 + z(T_2 - T_1^*T_3))) \\ &= \text{ Re } (\alpha((T_1 + zT_2) - (zT_1^* - T_2^*)T_3)) \\ &= \text{ Re } (\alpha((T_1 + zT_2) - z(T_1^* - \overline{z}T_2^*)T_3)) \\ &= \text{ Re } (\alpha((T_1 + zT_2) - (T_1 + zT_2)^* zT_3)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$D_{P_z}^2 \geq \text{ Re } \alpha(S_z - S_z^* P_z)$$

for all α on the circle which is the same as saying that $\rho(\alpha S_z, \alpha^2 P_z) \geq 0$ for all α on the unit circle. That finishes the proof.

(3) ⇒ (4): The uniqueness part is the simplest. Indeed, let F_1 and F_1' be two bounded operators on $\overline{\text{R}an D}$ both of which satisfy the first fundamental equation $\Sigma_1 = DXD$. Then $F = F_1 - F_1'$ satisfies $DFD = 0$. Now, for x and y in H, we have $\langle FDx, Dy\rangle = \langle DFDx, y\rangle = 0$ and hence $F_1 - F_1' = 0$. The existence part of this prof starts from the fact that (S_z, P_z) is a Γ-contraction for any z on the circle. Appeal to Theorem 1.5 again. The Γ-contraction (S_z, P_z) has a fundamental operator, call it $F(z)$. It satisfies

$$S_z - S_z^* P_z = D_{P_z} F(z) D_{P_z} \text{ and } w(F(z)) \leq 1$$

where w stands for the numerical radius. Recalling what S_z and P_z are, the last equation becomes

$$\Sigma_1 + z\Sigma_2 = DF(z)D.$$

This holds for all z on the unit circle. Integrating over the unit circle, we see that $\Sigma_1 = DF_1D$ where F_1 is the integration of the function F over the unit circle. Thus

$$z\Sigma_2 = D(F(z) - F_1)D$$

for all z on the unit circle and hence putting $z = 1$, we get that $\Sigma_2 = DF_2D$ where $F_2 = F(1) - F_1$. Thus we see that F is a linear function $F(z) = F_1 + zF_2$ for some bounded operators F_1 and F_2 on $\overline{\text{R}an D}$ and

$$\Sigma_1 = DF_1D \text{ and } \Sigma_2 = DF_2D.$$

□

Armed with the fundamental operators F_1 and F_2 of a tetrablock contraction $\underline{T}$, we are ready to investigate those tetrablock contractions which are special. A unitary operator is a special kind of contraction because it is normal and its spectrum is contained in the unit circle. Indeed, that is a characterization. The next section completely unravels the structure of a commuting triple which consists of normal operators and whose Taylor joint spectrum is contained in the distinguished boundary of E.

3. TETRABLOCK UNITARIES AND TETRABLOCK ISOMETRIES

The beginning of this section warrants a discussion on what the distinguished boundary of a domain Ω is. Any study of a dilation involves those special tuples of operators whose joint spectrum is contained in the distinguished boundary $b\Omega$ of Ω. Let $A(\Omega)$ be the algebra of continuous scalar functions on $\overline{\Omega}$ that are holomorphic on Ω. A boundary for Ω is a subset C of Ω such that every function in $A(\Omega)$ attains its maximum modulus on C. It is well-known that for a polynomially convex Ω, there is a smallest closed boundary of Ω, contained in all the closed boundaries of Ω. This is called the distinguished boundary of Ω. We need characterizations of the distinguished boundary of $\overline{E}$ and this is given in [1]. We quote parts of Theorem 7.1 from there.

Theorem 3.1 (Abouhajar, White, Young)**.** *For $\underline{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3$, the following are equivalent.*

(1) $\underline{x} \in bE$,
(2) $x_1 = \overline{x}_2 x_3, |x_3| = 1$ *and* $|x_2| \leq 1$;

(3) *there exists a* 2×2 *unitary matrix* U *such that* $x = \pi(U)$*;*
(4) *there exists a symmetric* 2×2 *unitary matrix* U *such that* $x = \pi(U)$*;*
(5) $\underline{x} \in \overline{E}$ *and* $|x_3| = 1$.

Motivated by Lemma 2.2, it is natural to ask whether an analogous characterization holds for the distinguished boundary and the answer is yes.

Lemma 3.2. *A triple* $\underline{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in bE$ *if and only if* $(x_1 + zx_2, zx_3) \in b\Gamma$ *for all* z *from the unit circle.*

Proof. Indeed, if $(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in bE$, then we know from Lemma 2.2 that $(s_z, p_z) \in \Gamma$ and we know from Theorem 3.1 that $|p_z| = 1$. These two together form a characterization for (s_z, p_z) to be in $b\Gamma$ (see Theorem 1.3 of [6]). Conversely, if for every z on the unit circle, $(s_z, p_z) \in b\Gamma$, then by Lemma 2.2, we have $(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in E$. That along with the fact $|x_3| = 1$ implies that (x_1, x_2, x_3) has to be in bE by part (5) of Theorem 3.1. $\square$

We begin the study of those tetrablock contractions which are special in the same sense that unitaries are special among contractions. So these special tetrablock contractions are the candidates for dilation.

Definition 3.3. *A tetrablock unitary is a commuting triple of normal operators* $\underline{N} = (N_1, N_2, N_3)$ *such that* $\sigma(\underline{N}) \subset bE$.

Theorem 3.4. *Let* $\underline{N} = (N_1, N_2, N_3)$ *be a commuting triple of bounded operators. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) $\underline{N}$ *is a tetrablock unitary,*
(2) N_3 *is a unitary,* N_2 *is a contraction and* $N_1 = N_2^* N_3$,
(3) *there is a* 2×2 *unitary block operator matrix* $[U_{ij}]$ *where* U_{ij} *are commuting normal operators and* $\underline{N} = (U_{11}, U_{22}, U_{11}U_{22} - U_{21}U_{12})$,
(4) N_3 *is a unitary and* $\underline{N}$ *is a tetrablock contraction,*
(5) *the family* $\{(R_z, U_z) : |z| = 1\}$ *where* $R_z = N_1 + zN_2$ *and* $U_z = zN_3$ *is a commuting family of* Γ*-unitaries.*

Proof. (1) ⇒ (2): By definition of a tetrablock unitary, N_1, N_2 and N_3 are commuting normal operators and their Taylor joint spectrum is contained in bE. By spectral mapping theorem, $\sigma(N_3) = P_3\sigma(\underline{N})$ where P_3 is the projection onto the third co-ordinate. Since $\sigma(\underline{N})$ is contained in bE, we have $|\lambda| = 1$ for all $\lambda \in \sigma(N_3)$. So N_3 is a normal operator with its spectrum contained in the unit circle. So it is a unitary.

Consider the C^*-algebra $\mathcal{C}$ generated by the commuting normal operators N_1, N_2 and N_3. This commutative C^*-algebra is isometrically isomorphic, by the Gelfand map, to $C(\sigma(\underline{N}))$. The Gelfand map takes N_i to the co-ordinate function x_i for $i = 1, 2, 3$. The co-ordinate functions satisfy $x_1 = \overline{x}_2 x_3$ on the whole of bE and hence on $\sigma(\underline{N})$ which is contained in bE. Thus $N_1 = N_2^* N_3$.

(2) ⇒ (3): We first note that N_2 is normal. Indeed, using the fact that $N_1 = N_2^* N_3$, we get that $N_1 N_2 = N_2^* N_3 N_2 = N_2^* N_2 N_3$. On the other hand, $N_2 N_1 = N_2 N_2^* N_3$. Since N_1 and N_2 commute, we have $N_2^* N_2 N_3 = N_2 N_2^* N_3$. Multiplying both sides on the right by N_3^*, we get N_2 to be normal. Now just take

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} N_2^* N_3 & -D_{N_2} \\ N_3 D_{N_2} & N_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

(3) ⇒ (4): We shall verify that $\underline{N}$ is a tetrablock contraction by using Lemma 2.3. First note that, because U is a unitary, we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} = U^*U = \begin{pmatrix} U_{11}^* & U_{21}^* \\ U_{12}^* & U_{22}^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} U_{11} & U_{12} \\ U_{21} & U_{22} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} U_{11}^*U_{11} + U_{21}^*U_{21} & U_{11}^*U_{12} + U_{21}^*U_{22} \\ U_{12}^*U_{11} + U_{22}^*U_{21} & U_{12}^*U_{12} + U_{22}^*U_{22} \end{pmatrix}.$$

So

$$U_{11}^*U_{11} + U_{21}^*U_{21} = I = U_{12}^*U_{12} + U_{22}^*U_{22} \tag{3.1}$$

and

$$U_{12}^*U_{11} + U_{22}^*U_{21} = 0. \tag{3.2}$$

Since U_{11}, U_{12}, U_{21} and U_{22} are commuting normal operators, given any $(z_{11}, z_{12}.z_{21}, z_{22}) \in \sigma(U_{11}, U_{12}, U_{21}, U_{22})$, we have

$$(z_{11}, z_{12}.z_{21}, z_{22}, \overline{z}_{11}, \overline{z}_{12}, \overline{z}_{21}, \overline{z}_{22}) \in \sigma(U_{11}, U_{12}, U_{21}, U_{22}, U_{11}^*, U_{12}^*, U_{21}^*, U_{22}^*).$$

Thus by the relations (3.1) and (3.2), we have

$$|z_{11}|^2 + |z_{21}|^2 = 1 = |z_{12}|^2 + |z_{22}|^2 \text{ and } \overline{z}_{12}z_{11} + \overline{z}_{22}z_{21} = 0.$$

Thus the scalar matrix $Z = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} z_{11} & z_{12} \\ z_{21} & z_{22} \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ is a unitary. Let p be a polynomial in three variables. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|p(N_1, N_2, N_3)\| \\
= \ & r(p(N_1, N_2, N_3))[\text{by normality}] \\
= \ & \sup\{|p(\pi(Z))| : Z = \begin{pmatrix} z_{11} & z_{12} \\ z_{21} & z_{22} \end{pmatrix} \text{ with } (z_{11}, z_{12}.z_{21}, z_{22}) \in \sigma(U_{11}, U_{12}, U_{21}, U_{22})\} \\
\leq \ & \sup\{|p(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)| : (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) \in bE\}[\text{by the discussion above}] \\
\leq \ & \sup\{|p(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)| : (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) \in \overline{E}\} = \|p\|_{\infty, E}
\end{aligned}$$

proving that $\underline{N}$ is a tetrablock contraction.

(4) ⇒ (5): From Theorem 2.4, we know that (R_z, U_z) is a Γ-contraction for every z on the unit circle. Moreover, U_z is a unitary. A Γ-contraction whose second component is a unitary has to be a Γ-unitary, see part (4) of Theorem 2.5 of [9]. The commutativity is clear.

(5) ⇒ (1): First note that N_3 is a unitary by putting $z = 1$. Since R_1 and R_{-1} are commuting normal operators, $N_1 = (R_1 + R_{-1})/2$ and $N_2 = (R_1 - R_{-1})/2$ are commuting normal operators. It remains to see that the joint spectrum $\sigma(\underline{N})$ is contained in bE.

The proof of that will depend on the observation that $(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in bE$ if and only if for every z on the unit circle, $(s_z, p_z) \in b\Gamma$ where $s_z = x_1 + zx_2$ and $p_z = zx_3$. Let (x_1, x_2, x_3) be a point in the Taylor joint spectrum $\sigma(\underline{N})$ of $\underline{N}$. Let z be from the unit circle. Then the Taylor joint spectrum of (R_z, U_z) is the set $\{(s_z, p_z) : s_z = x_1 + zx_2$ and $p_z = zx_3\}$ which is contained in $b\Gamma$ because (R_z, U_z) is a Γ-unitary. Thus any point (x_1, x_2, x_3) in $\sigma(\underline{N})$ has the property that $(x_1 + zx_2, zx_3)$ is in $b\Gamma$ for every z on the unit circle. By Lemma 3.2 above, (x_1, x_2, x_3) then has to be in bE and that completes the proof. □

The class of tetrablock contractions that are natural candidates for dilation are the tetrablock unitaries for reasons that have been amply described. However, we can simplify our lives by enlarging the class to include the following.

Definition 3.5. *A tetrablock isometry is the restriction of a tetrablock unitary to a joint invariant subspace.*

This is also expressed by saying that a tetrablock isometry is a triple of commuting bounded operators which has a simultaneous *extension* to a tetrablock unitary. Thus a tetrablock isometry $\underline{V} = (V_1, V_2, V_3)$ always consists of commuting subnormal operators. Moreover, V_3 has to be an isometry. Call $\underline{V}$ a *pure* tetrablock isometry if V_3 is a pure isometry, i.e., a shift of some multiplicity. When we dilate a tetrablock contraction, it will be enough to dilate only to a tetrablock isometry because extension of a dilation is a dilation again as we shall see when we define dilation in the next section. It is for this reason that we need to understand the structure of tetrablock isometries completely. The rest of this section does that,

Theorem 3.6 (Wold decomposition for a tetrablock isometry)**.** *Let $\underline{V} = (V_1, V_2, V_3)$ be a tetrablock isometry on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Then there is a decomposition of $\mathcal{H}$ into a direct sum $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2$ satisfying the following two conditions.*

1. *The subspaces $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ are reducing subspaces for each of the V_i.*
2. *If $N_i = V_i|_{\mathcal{H}_1}$ and $W_i = V_i|_{\mathcal{H}_2}$, then the triple $\underline{N}$ is a tetrablock unitary and the triple $\underline{W}$ is a pure tetrablock isometry.*

Proof. Let $V_3 = N_3 \oplus W_3$ be the Wold decomposition of the isometry V_3 into its unitary part N_3 and the shift part W_3. Suppose $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2$ be the corresponding decomposition of the whole space $\mathcal{H}$. Thus V_3 has the block matrix decomposition

$$V_3 = \begin{pmatrix} N_3 & 0 \\ 0 & W_3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

If we now write V_2 according to this decomposition of the space, then let its block matrix form be

$$V_2 = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{pmatrix}.$$

By commutativity of V_2 with V_3, the off diagonal entries A_{12} and A_{21} end up commuting with the unitary N_3 and the shift W_3. It is old wisdom that no non-zero operator can do that because $(W_3^*)^n$ converges to 0 strongly as n tends to ∞. Thus V_2 is diagonal too, say $V_2 = N_2 \oplus W_2$ where N_2 and W_2 are contractions. Note that $V_1 = V_2^* V_3$ because it inherits this property from its normal extension. Indeed, by definition of a tetrablock isometry, there is a Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}$ containing $\mathcal{H}$ and a tetrablock unitary (M_1, M_2, M_3) on $\mathcal{K}$ such that $M_i|_{\mathcal{H}} = V_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Thus for h_1 and h_2 in $\mathcal{H}$, we have

$$\langle V_1 h_1, h_2\rangle = \langle M_1 h_1, h_2\rangle = \langle M_2^* M_3 h_1, h_2\rangle = \langle M_3 h_1, M_2 h_2\rangle = \langle V_3 h_1, V_2 h_2\rangle = \langle V_2^* V_3 h_1, h_2\rangle.$$

Consequently, $V_1 = N_1 \oplus W_1$ where $N_1 = N_2^* N_3$ and $W_1 = W_2^* W_3$. By part (2) of Theorem 3.3, we have that (N_1, N_2, N_3) is a tetrablock unitary. Thus our given tuple $\underline{V}$ has now been written as the direct sum of a tetrablock unitary $\underline{N}$ and a tuple $\underline{W}$ whose third component W_3 is a shift. That completes the proof. $\square$

However, given a triple, how does one decide whether it is a tetrablock isometry or not. The following result gives necessary and sufficient criteria. The fourth part will be very handy when we construct the dilation.

Theorem 3.7. *Let $\underline{V} = (V_1, V_2, V_3)$ be a commuting triple of bounded operators. Then the following are equivalent.*

(1) *$\underline{V}$ is a tetrablock isometry.*
(2) *$\underline{V}$ is a tetrablock contraction and V_3 is an isometry.*
(3) *V_3 is an isometry, V_2 is a contraction and V_1 is the same as $V_2^*V_3$.*
(4) *V_3 is an isometry, $r(V_1) \leq 1$, $r(V_2) \leq 1$ and V_1 is the same as $V_2^*V_3$ where r stands for spectral radius.*

Remark 3.8. *Note that post facto, (3) and (4) above imply that $V_2 = V_1^*V_3$ as well.*

Proof. We shall prove that (1) ⇒ (2) ⇒ (3) ⇒ (1) and then (3) ⇒ (4) ⇒ (3).

(1) ⇒ (2): Given a tetrablock isometry $\underline{V} = (V_1, V_2, V_3)$ on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, by its definition, there is a Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}$ containing $\mathcal{H}$ and a tetrablock unitary $\underline{N} = (N_1, N_2, N_3)$ acting on $\mathcal{K}$ for which $\mathcal{H}$ is an invariant subspace and $V_i = N_i|_{\mathcal{H}}$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. It is then clear that V_3 is an isometry because it is the restriction of the unitary N_3 to the invariant subspace $\mathcal{H}$. It is also clear that $\underline{V}$ is a tetrablock contraction because it is the restriction of a tetrablock contraction $\underline{N}$ to an invariant subspace.

(2) ⇒ (3): This part will require the solutions of the fundamental equations. This is a major departure from the theory of Γ-contractions because properties of Γ-isometries were deduced before the fundamental equation for a Γ-contraction was introduced. In the case of a tetrablock isometry, it is simplest to use the fundamental equations since existence and uniqueness of fundamental operators have already been deduced in Section 2. Since $\underline{V}$ is a tetrablock contraction, the first fundamental equation has a solution. Since V_3 is an isometry, the right hand side of that equation vanishes and hence we have $V_1 = V_2^*V_3$ (of course, we also have $V_2 = V_1^*V_3$ from the second fundamental equation, but this is redundant). Contractivity of V_2 (or equivalently V_1) holds because all components of a tetrablock contraction are contractions.

(3) ⇒ (1): Given a commuting triple $\underline{V} = (V_1, V_2, V_3)$ on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ consisting of an isometry V_3, a contraction V_2 commuting with V_3 and $V_1 = V_2^*V_3$, we invoke the Wold decomposition of the isometry V_3. This gives a decomposition of the space $\mathcal{H}$ into a direct sum $\mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2$ according to which V_3 decomposes as the direct sum of a normal operator N_3 and a shift W_3. We find that V_2, because it commutes with V_3, has $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ as reducing subspaces. Similarly, for V_1. This part of the argument has been detailed above in the proof of the Wold decomposition of a tetrablock isometry. Let N_1, N_2, W_1 and W_2 be as in that proof. Moreover, the relations $N_1 = N_2^*N_3$ and $W_1 = W_2^*W_3$ follow because of the given relation $V_1 = V_2^*V_3$. Then the commuting triple $\underline{N}$ consists of a unitary N_3, a contraction N_2 and $N_1 = N_2^*N_3$. Thus it is a tetrablock unitary. Thus to show that $\underline{V}$ is a tetrablock isometry, we need to show that the tuple $\underline{W}$ can be extended to a tetrablock unitary, since the other part $\underline{N}$ is already a tetrablock unitary.

Realize W_3 as multiplication by the co-ordinate function z on a vector valued Hardy space $H^2(E)$ where the dimension of E is the multiplicity of the shift W_3. Since W_1 and W_2 commute with this shift and with each other, there are commuting $H^\infty(E)$ functions φ_1 and φ_2 such that $W_i = T_{\varphi_i}$, the multiplication on $H^2(E)$ by φ_i for $i = 1, 2$. Moreover, the H^∞ norms of the operator valued functions φ_1 and φ_2 are not greater than one since W_1 and W_2 are contractions. Because $W_1 = {W_2}^*W_3$, or equivalently $M_{\varphi_1}^E = {M_{\varphi_2}^E}^* M_z^E$, we have

$$\varphi_1(z) = {\varphi_2}^*(z)z \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{T}. \tag{3.3}$$

Consider on $L^2(E)$, the multiplication operators $U_{\varphi_1}^E, U_{\varphi_2}^E$ and U_z^E, multiplications by $\varphi_1(z)$, $\varphi_2(z)$ and z respectively. Obviously U_z^E is a unitary operator on $L^2(E)$. Because of the relation (3.3) that the functions φ_1 and φ_2 satisfy, we have $U_{\varphi_1}^E = (U_{\varphi_2}^E)^*U_z^E$.

Altogether the triple $(U^E_{\varphi_1}, U^E_{\varphi_2}, U^E_z)$ makes a tetrablock unitary and it extends the triple $\underline{W}$. So we are done.

Thus we have proved (1) ⇒ (2) ⇒ (3) ⇒ (1). For the remaining part, first note that (3) implies (4) trivially. For the converse, since we have $V_1 = V_2^*V_3$, multiplying both sides from the left by V_3^*, we get $V_3^*V_1 = V_3^*V_2^*V_3$ which by commutativity is the same as $V_2^*V_3^*V_3$ which again is just V_2^* because V_3 is an isometry. Thus $V_2 = V_1^*V_3$ as well. Consider the two operators

$$B_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & V_1 \\ V_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } B_2 = \begin{pmatrix} V_3 & 0 \\ 0 & V_3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

By the relations $V_1 = V_2^*V_3$ and $V_2 = V_1^*V_3$, this pair satisfies $B_1 = B_1^*B_2$. This immediately implies that B_1 is hyponormal. Indeed, $B_1B_1^* = B_1^*B_3B_3^*B_1 \leq B_1^*B_1$ and this is the defining property of hyponormality. In fact, the pair (B_1, B_2) is a Γ-contraction, but that is besides the point.

Now we use a remarkable theorem due to Stampfli.

Theorem 3.9 (Stampfli)**.** *If X is a hyponormal operator, then $\|X^n\| = \|X\|^n$ and so $\|X\| = r(X)$.*

For a proof of this theorem, see Proposition 4.6 of [10].

We shall use it with $X = B_1$ to get that $\|B_1\| = r(B_1)$. The operator norm of B_1 is as follows.

$$\|B_1\|^2 = \| \begin{pmatrix} 0 & V_1 \\ V_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & V_2^* \\ V_1^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} \| = \| \begin{pmatrix} V_1V_1^* & 0 \\ 0 & V_2V_2^* \end{pmatrix} \| = \max\{\|V_1\|^2, \|V_2\|^2\}.$$

Thus $\|B_1\| = \max\{\|V_1\|, \|V_2\|\}$. Now, for the spectral radius, we apply the spectral radius formula. A straightforward computation using commutativity of V_1 and V_2 shows that

$$B_1^{2n} = \begin{pmatrix} (V_1V_2)^n & 0 \\ 0 & (V_1V_2)^n \end{pmatrix}.$$

Consequently, $r(B_1) = \lim \|B_1^{2n}\|^{1/2n} = \lim \|(V_1V_2)^n\|^{1/2n} = r(V_1V_2)^{1/2}$. Because V_1 and V_2 commute, the spectrum of V_1V_2 is contained in the set $\{\lambda\mu : \lambda \in \sigma(V_1) \text{ and } \mu \in \sigma(V_2)\}$. Thus, given that both V_1 and V_2 have spectral radii not greater than one, the same is true for V_1V_2. Consequently, $r(B_1) \leq 1$. thus by Stampfli's result, both V_1 and V_2 are contractions. □

We have a structure theorem for pure tetrablock isometries to go with the result above.

Theorem 3.10. *Let $\underline{V} = (V_1, V_2, V_3)$ be a commuting triple of bounded operators on a separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Then $\underline{V}$ is a pure tetrablock isometry if and only if there is a separable Hilbert space E, a unitary $U : \mathcal{H} \to H^2(E)$ and two bounded operators τ_1 and τ_2 on E such that*

1. *the H^∞ norm of the operator valued function $\tau_1 + \tau_2 z$ is at most 1,*
2. *$V_3 = U^*M^E_zU, V_2 = U^*M^E_{\varphi_2}U$ and $V_1 = U^*M^E_{\varphi_1}U$ where $\varphi_1(z) = \tau_1 + \tau_2 z$ and $\varphi_2(z) = \tau_2^* + \tau_1^* z$.*

Proof. The existence of E is due to the fact that V_3 is a pure isometry and hence is necessarily of the form of multiplication by z on $H^2(E)$ for some E.

By the commutativity of the V_i, we have the following form for V_1 and V_2. The operator $V_i = M^{\mathcal{D}}_{\varphi_i}$ for some φ_1 and φ_2 in $H^\infty(E)$. By $V_1 = V_2^*V_3$ (because $\underline{V}$ is a tetrablock isometry), we get, by using the power series expansion of the holomorphic functions φ_1 and φ_2 that they necessarily have to be of the form

$$\varphi_1(z) = \tau_1 + \tau_2 z \text{ and } \varphi_2(z) = \tau_2^* + \tau_1^* z.$$

□

After all the hard work in this section for deciphering the structure of two special kinds of tetrablock contractions, we are ready to construct the diltion.

4. DILATION

4.1. **New results on Γ-contractions.** Interestingly, it is Γ-contractions that will shed light on dilation of tetrablock contractions. We shall see how, in the next subsection. Here we harvest a new result. For a contraction P, let $D_P = (I - P^*P)^{1/2}$. Let $\mathcal{D}_P$ be the closure of range of the positive operator D_P. Recall from Theorem 1.5 that the fundamental operator of a Γ-contraction (S, P) is an operator on $\mathcal{D}_P$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let S_1, S_2 and P be three commuting bounded operators such that P is a contraction with dense range. Suppose, moreover, that (S_1, P) and (S_2, P) are Γ-contractions with their fundamental operators A_1 and A_2 respectively. Then*

1. *A_1 and A_2 commute,*
2. *$[A_1, A_2^*] + [A_1^*, A_2] = 0$,*
3. *$S_1^*S_2 - S_2^*S_1 = D_P(A_1^*A_2 - A_2^*A_1)D_P$.*

Proof. This proof will use a relation which originally appeared in the proof of Theorem 4.3 of [9]. We recall this relation and its brief proof. The relation says that if A is the fundamental operator of a Γ-contraction (S, P), then

$$D_P S = A D_P + A^* D_P P. \tag{4.1}$$

The proof of this relation is simple. Let $G = A^*D_PP + AD_p - D_pS$. Then G is defined from $\mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{D}_P$. Since A is the fundamental operator of the Γ-contraction (S, P), we have

$$D_PG = D_PA^*D_PP + D_PAD_P - {D_P}^2S = (S^* - P^*S)P + (S - S^*P) - (I - P^*P)S = 0.$$

Now $\langle Gh, D_Ph'\rangle = \langle D_PGh, h'\rangle = 0 \quad$ for all $h, h' \in \mathcal{H}$. This shows that $G = 0$ and hence $A^*D_PP + AD_P = D_PS$.

Let us now get down to the proof of this new result about Γ-contractions. We are given that $S_1S_2 = S_2S_1$. Then $D_PS_1S_2 = D_PS_2S_1$. Now, by using (4.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(A_1D_P + A_1^*D_PP)S_2 &= (A_2D_P + A_2^*D_PP)S_1\\
A_1D_PS_2 + A_1^*D_PPS_2 &= A_2D_PS_1 + A_2^*D_PPS_1\\
A_1(A_2D_P + A_2^*D_PP) + A_1^*D_PS_2P &= A_2(A_1D_P + A_1^*D_PP) + A_2^*D_PS_1P\\
[A_1, A_2]D_P + (A_1A_2^* - A_2A_1^*)D_PP &= A_2^*(A_1D_P + A_1^*D_PP)P - A_1^*(A_2D_P + A_2^*D_PP)P
\end{aligned}$$

When the last line is simplified, it gives

$$[A_1, A_2]D_P + ([A_1, A_2^*] + [A_1^*, A_2])D_PP + [A_1^*, A_2^*]D_PP^2 = 0. \tag{4.2}$$

This is true for any contraction P which has associated with itself two commuting bounded operators S_1 and S_2 such that (S_1, P) and (S_2, P) are Γ-contractions with fundamental operators A_1 and A_2. Replace the contraction P by z^2P and the bounded operators S_i by zS_i for $i = 1, 2$ where z comes from the unit circle. Then the three operators zS_1, zS_2 and z^2P satisfy the hypotheses of the lemma with the fundamental operators A_1 and A_2 getting changed to zA_1 and zA_2. This is because they satisfy the fundamental equation

$$(zS_i) - (zS_i)^*(z^2P) = D_{z^2P}(zA_i)D_{z^2P}$$

for $i = 1, 2$. Note that D_{z^2P} and D_P are same. Putting these in (4.2), we get

$$z^2[A_1, A_2]D_P + z^2([A_1, A_2^*] + [A_1^*, A_2])D_P P + [A_1^*, A_2^*]D_P P^2 = 0.$$

Since this is true for all z on the unit circle, we have $[A_1^*, A_2^*]D_P P^2 = 0$. Because P has dense range, we get that $[A_1, A_2] = 0$. This then gives us, using the coefficient of z^2 that $([A_1, A_2^*] + [A_1^*, A_2])D_P P = 0$. Again, because P has dense range, we have $[A_1, A_2^*] + [A_1^*, A_2] = 0$. For the last part of the lemma, using commutativity of S_1 and S_2, we get $S_2^*S_1^*P = S_1^*S_2^*P$. Now we use the fundamental equation for Γ-contractions to get that

$$S_2^*(S_1 - D_P A_1 D_P) = S_1^*(S_2 - D_P A_2 D_P).$$

Thus, using (4.1) again, we get that $S_2^*S_1 - S_1^*S_2$ is the same as $(D_P A_2^* + P^* D_P A_2)A_1 D_P - (D_P A_1^* + P^* D_P A_1)A_2 D_P$ which is equal to $D_P(A_2^*A_1 - A_1^*A_2)D_P$. That proves the lemma. □

Corollary 4.2. *Let $\underline{T}$ be a tetrablock contraction with T_3 having dense range. Then the fundamental operators F_1 and F_2 of the tetrablock contraction $\underline{T}$ have the following properties:*

(1) *they commute,*
(2) $[F_1^*, F_1] - [F_2^*, F_2] = 0$,
(3) $T_1^*T_1 - T_2^*T_2 = D(F_1^*F_1 - F_2^*F_2)D$.

Proof. The proof of commutativity of F_1 and F_2 and the two other properties will use the new results about Γ-contractions proved in Section 2.

Put $S_1 = T_1 + zT_2, S_2 = zT_1 + T_2$ and $P = zT_3$ in Lemma 4.1. It is clear that the hypotheses of the lemma are satisfied. The fundamental operators are

$$A_1 = F_1 + zF_2 \text{ and } A_2 = zF_1 + F_2.$$

They commute. Since that is true for all z on the unit circle, F_1 and F_2 have to commute.

Now note that

$$A_1A_2^* = (F_1 + zF_2)(zF_1 + F_2)^* = (F_1 + zF_2)(\overline{z}F_1^* + F_2^*) = F1F_2^* + F_2F_1^* + zF_2F_2^* + \overline{z}F_1F_1^*.$$

Similarly, $A_2^*A_1 = F_2^*F_1 + F_1^*F_2 + \overline{z}F_1^*F_1 + zF_2^*F_2$ and $A_1^*A_2 = F_1^*F_2 + F_2^*F_1 + \overline{z}F_2^*F_2 + zF_1^*F_1$ and $A_2A_1^* = F_2F_1^* + F_1F_2^* + zF_1F_1^* + \overline{z}F_2F_2^*$. Thus $[A_1, A_2^*] + [A_1^*, A_2] = (\overline{z} - z)([F_1^*, F_1] - [F_2^*, F_2])$. Hence $[F_1^*, F_1] - [F_2^*, F_2] = 0$.

The last bit follows from the last part of Lemma 4.1. With S_1, S_2 and P as above, we shall get

$$S_1^*S_2 - S_2^*S_1 = (z - \overline{z})(T_1^*T_1 - T_2^*T_2) \text{ and } A_1^*A_2 - A_2^*A_1 = (z - \overline{z})(F_1^*F_1 - F_2^*F_2).$$

That finishes the proof. □

4.2. **Construction of dilation.** Given three commuting bounded operators T_1, T_2 and T_3 on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, a simultaneous dilation of them consists of three commuting bounded operators V_1, V_2 and V_3 on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}$ containing $\mathcal{H}$ in such a way that $\mathcal{H}$ is a co-invariant subspace of the V_i and the restriction of V_i^* to $\mathcal{H}$ is T_i^*. This automatically implies that

$$P_{\mathcal{H}} V_1^{k_1} V_2^{k_2} V_3^{k_3}|_{\mathcal{H}} = T_1^{k_1} T_2^{k_2} T_3^{k_3} \tag{4.3}$$

for all non-negative integers k_1, k_2 and k_3. The dilation is called minimal if

$$\mathcal{K} = \overline{\operatorname{span}}\{T_1^{k_1} T_2^{k_2} T_3^{k_3} h : k_1, k_2 \text{ and } k_3 \text{ are non-negative integers and } h \in \mathcal{H}\}.$$

Dilation was a game-changing new geometric concept introduced by Sz.-Nagy and has made effective yet unpredictable appearances in many places. For more details, see the classic [15]. As we have noted already, we need to produce here a tetrablock unitary dilation of a tetrablock contraction. It is enough to produce a tetrablock isometric dilation because extension of a dilation is a dilation.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $\underline{T} = (T_1, T_2, T_3)$ be a tetrablock contraction on $\mathcal{H}$. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be the closure of the range of D. Let $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{D} \oplus \mathcal{D} \oplus \cdots = \mathcal{H} \oplus l^2(\mathcal{D})$. Consider the operators V_1, V_2 and V_3 defined on $\mathcal{K}$ by*

$$\begin{aligned}
V_1(h_0, h_1, h_2, \dots) &= (T_1 h_0, F_2^* D h_0 + F_1 h_1, F_2^* h_1 + F_1 h_2, F_2^* h_2 + F_1 h_3, \dots)\\
V_2(h_0, h_1, h_2, \dots) &= (T_2 h_0, F_1^* D h_0 + F_2 h_1, F_1^* h_1 + F_2 h_2, F_1^* h_2 + F_2 h_3, \dots)\\
V_3(h_0, h_1, h_2, \dots) &= (T_3 h_0, D h_0, h_1, h_2, \dots).
\end{aligned}$$

Then

1. *$\underline{V} = (V_1, V_2, V_3)$ is a minimal tetrablock isometric dilation of $\underline{T}$ if T_3 has dense range.*
2. *If $\underline{W} = (W_1, W_2, W_3)$ is a tetrablock isometric dilation of $\underline{T}$ where W_3 is a minimal isometric dilation of T_3, then $\underline{W}$ is unitarily equivalent to $\underline{V}$.*

Proof. It is evident from the definition that V_3 on $\mathcal{K}$ is the minimal isometric dilation of T_3 in the Schäffer form. It is called so because in a one page paper [19] in 1955, Schäffer wrote down the block matrix form of the dilation after Sz.-Nagy showed its existence by using deep facts from complex analysis and measure theory. Schäffer wrote down the unitary dilation and we only have the isometry part of it here.

Obviously the adjoints of the three operators on $\mathcal{K}$ are

$$\begin{aligned}
V_1^*(h_0, h_1, h_2, \dots) &= (T_1^* h_0 + D F_2 h_1, F_1^* h_1 + F_2 h_2, F_1^* h_2 + F_2 h_3, \dots)\\
V_2^*(h_0, h_1, h_2, \dots) &= (T_2^* h_0 + D F_1 h_1, F_2^* h_1 + F_1 h_2, F_2^* h_2 + F_1 h_3, \dots)\\
V_3^*(h_0, h_1, h_2, \dots) &= (T_3^* h_0 + D h_1, h_2, h_3, \dots).
\end{aligned}$$

The space $\mathcal{H}$ can be embedded inside $\mathcal{K}$ by the map $h \mapsto (h, 0, 0, \dots)$. It is clear that $\mathcal{H}$, considered as a subspace of $\mathcal{K}$ is co-invariant under V_1, V_2 and V_3 and $V_i^*|_{\mathcal{H}} = T_i^*$ for all $i = 1, 2, 3$. This of course immediately implies (4.3). The job now is to show that $\underline{V}$ is a tetrablock isometry.

Since V_3 is an isometry, in order to show that $\underline{V}$ is a tetrablock isometry, one has to justify the following:

1. $\underline{V}$ is a commuting triple,
2. $V_1 = V_2^* V_3$,
3. $r(V_1) \le 1$ and $r(V_2) \le 1$.

If we can show these, then by part (4) of Theorem 3.7, $\underline{V}$ will be a tetrablock isometry.

$$\begin{aligned}
&V_1V_3(h_0,h_1,h_2,\dots)\\
&=V_1(T_3h_0,Dh_0,h_1,h_2,\dots)\\
&=(T_1T_3h_0,F_2^*DT_3h_0+F_1Dh_0,F_2^*Dh_0+F_1h_1,F_2^*h_1+F_1h_2,F_2^*h_2+F_1h_3,\dots).
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
V_3V_1(h_0,h_1,h_2,\dots)&=V_3(T_1h_0,F_2^*Dh_0+F_1h_1,F_2^*h_1+F_1h_2,F_2^*h_2+F_1h_3,\dots)\\
&=(T_3T_1h_0,DT_1h_0,F_2^*Dh_0+F_1h_1,F_2^*h_1+F_1h_2,F_2^*h_2+F_1h_3,\dots).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, to show that V_1 and V_3 commute, we only need to show that $DT_1=F_2^*DT_3+F_1D$. Similarly, for V_2 and V_3 to commute, the criterion is that $DT_2=F_1^*DT_3+F_2D$. These are very reminiscent of (4.1) that we used in the last subsection. We use this formula for the Γ-contraction (T_1+zT_2,zT_3) and its fundamental operator F_1+zF_2 where z is on the unit circle. We get

$$D(T_1+zT_2)=(F_1+zF_2)^*DzT_3+(F_1+zF_2)D=F_2^*DT_3+F_1D+z(F_1^*DT_3+F_2D).$$

This holds for every z on the unit circle. Therefore, the required criteria for commutativity are fulfilled. The commutativity of V_1 and V_2 i more non-trivial.

$$\begin{aligned}
V_1V_2(h_0,h_1,h_2,\dots)&=V_1(T_2h_0,F_1^*Dh_0F_2h_1,F_1^*h_1+F_2h_2,F_1^*h_2+F_2h_3,\dots)\\
&=(T_1T_2h_0,(F_2^*DT_2+F_1F_1^*D)h_0+F_1F_2h_1,F_2^*F_1^*Dh_0\\
&\quad+(F_2^*F_2+F_1F_1^*)h_1,F_2^*F_1^*h_1+(F_2^*F_2+F_1F_1^*)h_2,\dots)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
V_2V_1(h_0,h_1,h_2,\dots)&=V_2(T_1h_0,F_2^*Dh_0F_1h_1,F_2^*h_1+F_1h_2,F_2^*h_2+F_1h_3,\dots)\\
&=(T_2T_1h_0,(F_1^*DT_1+F_2F_2^*D)h_0+F_2F_1h_1,F_1^*F_2^*Dh_0\\
&\quad+(F_1^*F_1+F_2F_2^*)h_1,F_1^*F_2^*h_1+(F_1^*F_1+F_2F_2^*)h_2,\dots).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, to show that V_1 and V_2 commute, we need to show that

1. F_1 and F_2 commute,
2. $F_2^*F_2+F_1F_1^*=F_1^*F_1+F_2F_2^*$ and
3. $F_1^*DT_1+F_2F_2^*D=F_2^*DT_2+F_1F_1^*D$.

This is the place in the paper where the dense range assumption on T_3 will be used for dilation. We saw in Corollary 4.2 that the first two assertions hold good if T_3 has dense range. The third assertion, as we shall see below, will follow from the second one. For the third one, we have to prove that

$$F_1^*DT_1+F_2F_2^*D=F_2^*DT_2+F_1F_1^*D.$$

Or, in other words,

$$DF_1^*DT_1+DF_2F_2^*D=DF_2^*DT_2+DF_1F_1^*D$$

since the ranges of F_1 and F_2 are contained in $\mathcal{D}$. This last thing is the same as

$$(T_1-T_2^*T_3)^*T_1-(T_2-T_1^*T_3)^*T_2=D(F_1F_1^*-F_2F_2^*)D$$

by virtue of fundamental equations. By commutativity of T_1 and T_2, this is the same as

$$T_1^*T_1-T_2^*T_2=D(F_1F_1^*-F_2F_2^*)D.$$

In view of part 4(c) of Theorem 2.4, this is equivalent to

$$D(F_1^*F_1 - F_2^*F_2D = D(F_1F_1^* - F_2F_2^*)D$$

which we know to be true from part (2) above. Having gotten commutativity of the V_i, we show that $V_2^*V_3$ is V_1. This is a straightforward computation.

$$\begin{aligned} V_2^*V_3(h_0, h_1, h_2, \dots) &= V_2^*(T_3h_0, Dh_0, h_1, h_2, \dots) \\ &= (T_2^*T_3h_0 + DF_1Dh_0, F_2^*Dh_0 + F_1h_1, F_2^*h_1 + F_1h_2, F_2^*h_2 + F_1h_3, \dots). \end{aligned}$$

By the first fundamental equation, we have $T_2^*T_3 + DF_1D = T_1$. Therefore we have $V_2^*V_3 = V_1$.

We now show that $r(V_1) \le 1$ and $r(V_2) \le 1$. It is clear from the definition that V_1 has the matrix form

$$V_1 = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ F_2^*D & F_1 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & F_2^* & F_1 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & F_2^* & F_1 & \dots \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \end{pmatrix},$$

with respect to the decomposition $\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{D} \oplus \mathcal{D} \oplus \mathcal{D} \oplus ...$ of $\mathcal{K}_0$. Thus V_1 can be written as $\begin{pmatrix} T_1 & 0 \\ C_1 & D_1 \end{pmatrix}$ on $\mathcal{H} \oplus l^2(\mathcal{D}) = \mathcal{K}_0$, where $C_1 = \begin{pmatrix} F_2^*D \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix}$ and $D_1 = \begin{pmatrix} F_1 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ F_2^* & F_1 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & F_2^* & F_1 & \dots \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \end{pmatrix}$, we have by Lemma 1 of [12] that $\sigma(T_A) \subseteq \sigma(T_1) \cup \sigma(D_1)$. We shall be done if we show that $r(T_1)$ and $r(D_1)$ are not greater than 1. We shall show that the numerical radius of D_1 is not greater than 1. Since spectral radius is not greater than the numerical radius, we shall be done. Let us define

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi : \mathbb{D} &\to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}) \\ z &\to F_1 + F_2^*z. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly φ is holomorphic, bounded and continuous on the boundary $\partial\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{T}$ of the disc. Under the Hilbert space isomorphism which sends $\mathcal{D} \oplus \mathcal{D} \oplus \mathcal{D} \oplus ...$ to $H^2(\mathbb{D}) \otimes \mathcal{D}$, the operator D_1 goes to multiplication by the function φ. Now $w(M_\varphi) \le \sup\{w(\varphi(z)) : z \in \mathbb{T}\}$. Let us see what $w(\varphi(z))$ is. Recall that the numerical radius of an operator X is not greater than one if and only if the real part of the operator zX is not bigger than identity for every z on the unit circle see [7]. Since we know that $w(F_1 + zF_2) \le 1$, we have that $w(z_1F_1 + z_2F_2) \le 1$ for every z_1 and z_2 on the unit circle. Thus

$$(z_1F_1 + z_2F_2) + (z_1F_1 + z_2F_2)^* \le 2.$$

In other words,

$$(z_1F_1 + \overline{z}_2F_2^*) + (z_1F_1 + \overline{z}_2F_2^*)^* \le 2$$

which is the same as

$$z_1(F_1 + zF_2^*) + \overline{z}_1(F_1 + zF_2^*)^* \le 2$$

for every z and z_1 on the unit circle. And that by Ando's result again ([7]), implies that $w(F_1 + zF_2^*) \le 1$.

(2) Here, we shall many times use the natural identification between Hardy space $H^2(\mathcal{D})$ of $\mathcal{D}$ valued functions on the unit disk and $l^2(\mathcal{D}) = \mathcal{D} \oplus \mathcal{D} \oplus \mathcal{D} \dots$. This Hilbert space isomorphism will be used without further mention.

Obviously $W_3 = \begin{pmatrix} T_3 & 0 \\ C_3 & D_3 \end{pmatrix}$ with respect to the decomposition $\mathcal{H} \oplus l^2(\mathcal{D})$ of $\mathcal{K}_0$, where

$$C_3 = \begin{pmatrix} D \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix} \text{ from } \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{D} \oplus \mathcal{D} \oplus \mathcal{D} \oplus \dots \text{ and } D_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ I & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & I & 0 & \dots \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \end{pmatrix}$$

on $\mathcal{D} \oplus \mathcal{D} \oplus \mathcal{D} \oplus \dots$. From definition of dilation, we know that W_1 and W_2 on $\mathcal{H} \oplus l^2(\mathcal{D})$ have the matrix forms

$$W_i = \begin{pmatrix} T_i & 0 \\ C_i & D_i \end{pmatrix}$$

for some C_i and D_i for $i = 1, 2$. There is a natural identification of $\mathcal{D} \oplus \mathcal{D} \oplus \mathcal{D} \oplus \dots$ with $H^2(\mathcal{D})$ and under this Hilbert space isomorphism the operator D_3 is the same as the multiplication operator $M_z^{\mathcal{D}}$ on $H^2(\mathcal{D})$. Because $\underline{W}$ is a tetrablock isometry, we use the characterization obtained in Theorem 3.7 to get $W_1 = W_2^* W_3$ and hence

$$\begin{pmatrix} T_1 & 0 \\ C_1 & M_{\varphi_1}^{\mathcal{D}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} T_2^* & C_2^* \\ 0 & {M_{\varphi_2}^{\mathcal{D}}}^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} T_3 & 0 \\ C_3 & M_z^{\mathcal{D}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} T_2^* T_3 + C_2^* C_3 & C_2^* M_z^{\mathcal{D}} \\ {M_{\varphi_2}^{\mathcal{D}}}^* C_3 & {M_{\varphi_2}^{\mathcal{D}}}^* M_z^{\mathcal{D}} \end{pmatrix},$$

which gives

$$\begin{cases} \text{(i) } T_1 - T_2^* T_3 = C_2^* C_3 \\ \text{(ii) } C_1 = {M_{\varphi_1}^{\mathcal{D}}}^* C_3 \\ \text{(iii) } M_{\varphi_1}^{\mathcal{D}} = {M_{\varphi_2}^{\mathcal{D}}}^* M_z. \end{cases} \tag{4.4}$$

From (4.4)-(iii), it is clear by considering the power series expansions of φ_1 and φ_2 that $\varphi_1(z) = F_1 + F_2^* z$ and $\varphi_2(z) = F_2 + F_1^* z$ for some F_1 and F_2 in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D})$. Thus

$$D_1 = \begin{pmatrix} F_1 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ F_2^* & F_1 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & F_2^* & F_1 & \dots \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } D_2 = \begin{pmatrix} F_2 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ F_1^* & F_2 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & F_1^* & F_2 & \dots \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \end{pmatrix}$$

on $\mathcal{D} \oplus \mathcal{D} \oplus \mathcal{D} \oplus \dots$. Combining this with (4.4)-(ii), we get that

$$W_1 = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 & 0 \\ D_1^* C_3 & D_3 \end{pmatrix} \text{ on } \mathcal{H} \oplus l^2(\mathcal{D}_P).$$

Considering the stated matrix forms of D_1 and C_3 above, we get $D_1^* C_3 = \begin{pmatrix} F_2^* D \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix}$.

Hence with respect to the decomposition $\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{D} \oplus \mathcal{D} \oplus \dots$ of $\mathcal{K}_0$, we have

$$W_1 = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ F_2^* D & F_1 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & F_2^* & F_1 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & F_2^* & F_1 & \dots \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \end{pmatrix}.$$

The structure of W_2 is similar.

$\square$

5. Concluding Remarks

A compact subset K of $\mathbb{C}^n$ is called a spectral set for a commuting n-tuple of operators $\underline{T} = (T_1, T_2, \dots, T_n)$ if the Taylor joint spectrum of $\underline{T}$ is contained in K and

$$\|r(T_1, T_2, \dots, T_n)\| \leq \|r\|_{\infty,K} = \sup\{|r(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)| : (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) \in K\} \tag{5.1}$$

for any rational function r with poles off K. Here the norm on r is the supremum norm on K.

For an $m \times m$ matrix valued function r, we can make sense of $r(T_1, T_2, \dots T_n)$. Any such r is a matrix of functions of the form

$$r = [r_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^{m}$$

and hence

$$r(T_1, T_2, \dots T_n) = [r_{ij}(T_1, T_2, \dots T_n)]_{i,j=1}^{m}.$$

The set K is called a complete spectral set if the von Neumann type inequality (5.1) above holds for all rational functions taking values in matrices of any order with the norm now being

$$\|r\|_{\infty,K} = \sup\{\|r(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)\| : (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) \in K\}.$$

Say that K has the property **P** if the following holds. "If K is a spectral set for a commuting tuple $\underline{T}$, then it is a complete spectral set for $\underline{T}$."

1. In dimension one, the unit disk (von Neumann [21]) and the annulus (Agler [2]) have this property. Dritschel and McCullough proved in [13] that a multiply connected domain in general does not. They use Gel'fand-Naimark-Segal construction combined with a cone-separation argument. Agler, Harland and Raphael in [3] have shown that there exists a planar domain with two holes and an operator T on a Hilbert space of dimension 4 for which the property **P** fails.
2. In dimension two, the bidisc (Ando [8]) and the symmetrized bidisc have this property, see Agler and Young [4] - [6].
3. No subset of $\mathbb{C}^3$ with property **P** is known.
4. If K is the closed unit ball of some norm on $\mathbb{C}^n$ where $n > 2$, then K cannot have this property. See Paulsen [16] and Pisier [18].

Deciding whether a given domain is a complete spectral set for a commuting tuple of operators is a difficult question in general. It is very recent that one has been able to use solutions of operator equations to decide this. The symmetrized bidisc has been shown to be a complete spectral set of a pair of commuting operators if and only if an associated operator equation can be solved, see Theorem 1.5. The work of the present note would have been able to conclude that the tetrablock has the property **P** if the dilation could be constructed for any tetrablock contraction and not just those for which T_3 has dense range. This is a matter of further research.

References

[1] A. A. Abouhajar, M. C. White and N. J. Young, A Schwarz lemma for a domain related to μ-synthesis, *J. Geom. Anal.* 17 (2007), 717-750.

[2] J. Agler, Rational Dilation on an Annulus, *Annals of Math.* 121 (1985), 537-563.

[3] J. Agler, J. Harland and B. J. Raphael, Classical function theory, operator dilation theory, and machine computation on multiply-connected domains, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* 191 (2008), no. 892.

[4] J. Agler and N. J. Young, A commutant lifting theorem for a domain in $\mathbb{C}^2$ and spectral interpolation, *J. Funct. Anal.* 161 (1999), 452-477.

[5] J. Agler and N. J. Young, Operators having the symmetrized bidisc as a spectral set, *Proceedings of the Edinburgh Mathematical Society* 43 (2000), 195-210.

[6] J. Agler and N. J. Young, A model theory for Γ-contractions, *J. Operator Theory* 49 (2003), 45-60.

[7] T. Ando, Structure of operators with numerical radius one, *Acta Sci. Math. (szeged)*, 34 (1973), 11-15.

[8] T. Ando, On a pair of commutative contractions, *Acta Sci Math* 24 (1963), 88-90.

[9] T. Bhattacharyya, S. Pal and S. Shyam Roy, Dilations of Γ-contractions by solving operator equations, *Advances in Mathematics* 230 (2012), 577-606.

[10] J. B. Conway, The Theory of Subnormal Operators, *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 36, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI*, 1991.

[11] R. E. Curto, Applications of several complex variables to multiparameter spectral theory, Surveys of Some Recent Results in Operator Theory, Vol. II, *Pitman Res. Notes Math. Ser., Longman Sci. Tech., Harlow*, 192(1988), 25-90.

[12] D. Hong-Ke and P. Jin, Perturbation of spectrums of 2×2 operator matrices, *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 121 (1994), 761-766.

[13] M. A.Dritschel and S. McCullough, The failure of rational dilation on a triply connected domain, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 18 (2005), 873-918.

[14] T. Gamelin, Uniform Algebras, *Prentice-Hall, New Jersey*, 1969.

[15] Bela Sz.-Nagy, C. Foias, H. Bercovici, L. Kerchy, Harmonic Analysis of Operators on Hilbert Space, Universitext, *Springer, New York*, 2010.

[16] V. I. Paulsen, Every completely polynomially bounded operator is similar to a contraction, *Journal of Functional Analysis* 55 (1984), 117.

[17] V. I. Paulsen, Completely Bounded Maps and Operator Algebras, *Cambridge University Press*, 2002.

[18] G. Pisier, Introduction to Operator Space Theory, Cambridge University Press, 2003.

[19] J. J. Schäffer, On unitary dilations of contractions. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 6 (1955), 322.

[20] F. H. Vasilescu, Analytic Functional Calculus and Spectral Decompositions, *Editura Academiei: Bucuresti, Romania and D. Reidel Publishing Company*, 1982.

[21] J. von Neumann, Eine Spektraltheorie für allgemeine Operatoren eines unitären Raumes, Math. Nachr. 4 (1951), 258-281.

(Bhattacharyya) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE, BANAGLORE 560 012

E-mail address: `tirtha@member.ams.org`